



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/176,067	10/20/1998	GRAHAM J. DURANT	47578	7733

7590 01/15/2002

DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS & CUSHMAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP
EDWARDS & ANTELL
P.O. BOX 9169
BOSTON, MA 02209

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

O SULLIVAN, PETER G

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1621

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002

1✓

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/176,067	Applicant(s) Durant et al.
Examiner Peter O'Sullivan	Art Unit 1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 4, 2001

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-77 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 7-9 and 11-77 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1621

1. Claims 7-77 are pending in this application. In applicants' amendment a number of claims have been made to depend from non-elected claims. 7-9, 11 and 12-77 are held withdrawn from consideration. Claims 11 and 46-77 are held withdrawn because they are not currently rejected and contain subject matter not embraced by the elected species. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, fifth paragraph, the rejection under judicially created doctrine as comprising an improper Markush grouping the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections as anticipated by Okajima et al., Fukada et al., Augustin et al., Gund et al. and Neidlein et al are withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments and arguments.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mulyuga et al. who disclose N-4-methoxybenzoyl-N-benzylguanidine and N-4-chlorobenzoyl-N-benzylguanidine for example.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1621

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulyuga et al. Contra applicants' arguments, applicants' have not yet clearly delineated claim 10 from the prior art as noted above. Position isomers/homologues of anticipating compounds are still held to be obvious.

6. *No claim is allowed.*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter O'Sullivan at telephone number (703) 308-4526.



PETER O'SULLIVAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200